

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-11, which are all of the pending claims, over U.S. Patent 6,411,089 (Anupam, et al.). In particular, Claims 1-7 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by Anupam, et al. and Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Anupam, et al. The Examiner also rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite, and objected to the Abstract as being too long.

Independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 are herein being amended to better define the subject matter of these claims.

Also, Claim 6 is being amended to address the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §112. Specifically, the term "etc." is being taken out of the claim. In view of this, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Abstract is being amended to reduce its length and to be more narrative. It is believed that this overcomes any objection to the Abstract, and the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the Abstract.

The present invention, generally, relates to a method and system for implementing a high performance and real-time sharing of a browser. In the preferred embodiment, the system includes a collaboration server and plural user machines. The server accumulates pages generated on a Web server, and these pages can be sent to the user machines. The server also sends a NodeManager and PageManager to each user machine. The NodeManager controls the browser of the user machine, and the PageManager is used to detect changes in the pages, send those changes to other machines, and receive page changes from other machines.

An important feature of this invention is that the PageManager is embedded, by the Collaboration server, in each page sent to a user machine. This helps to insure that the

PageManager stays with each page and properly monitors and updates the pages. The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of the invention.

In particular, Anupam, et al. discloses a procedure for sharing work space via the Internet. In this shared work space, documents can be run and interactively, collaboratively shared by plural users. Code is transmitted to a prospective user to create an item referred to as a surrogate. Plural surrogates are connected by a controller that is used to update changes to the documents. Neither the surrogate nor the controller, though, are embedded by a central server in the pages that are downloaded to the user computers.

Independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 have been amended to more clearly describe this feature of this invention. More specifically, Claim 1, which is directed to a system for sharing a browser, is being amended to indicate that the PageManager is embedded in each of the browser pages. Claim 9, which is directed to a server for sharing a browser, is being amended to more positively describe the PageManager as being embedded in the page that is sent to the requesting computer. Similar amendments are being made to Claim 11. Claim 10 is also being amended to more positively set forth the feature of embedding on a requested page, a PageManager for controlling the page.

This feature of the invention is of utility because, with the PageManager embedded in the page, it is easier to keep the Manager with the page, both as it is being sent to the user computer and while on the user computer. This eliminates the need for the user computer to constantly match a page with the appropriate code for controlling or monitoring changes to the page.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and it is believed that these other references are no more pertinent than Anupam, et al. In particular, these other references,

whether they are considered individually or in combination, do not teach the principal of using the server to embed the PageManager in the pages that are sent to the user computers.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-8 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-11.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the Abstract and the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-11. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:gc